From: Molly Erickson
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2005 5:02 PM
To: Smith, Brian E.; Massera, Paul
Subject: Water Plan Update, Vol. 2, Ch. 6 (Desalination) questions

Hello Paul Massera and Brian Smith,

Paul Dabbs referred me to you. I have some questions about the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005, Volume 2, Chapter 6 (Desalination).

I am curious about the table on page 6-3 of the Public Review Draft. Would you please tell me how I can determine exactly which plants were counted in the various categories? I would like a complete list of the plants in the "seawater" row, and the annual capacity assigned to each plant, and the source relied upon for that assigned capacity. There are 13 plants in that row: 6 in Operation, 1 in Design & Construction, and 6 Planned or Projected.

The information in this table appears to be materially different in significant ways from
(1) the Coastal Commission's March 2004 "Seawater Desalination and the California Coastal Act" tables on pages 15 and 16, and
(2) the DWR's October 2003 "Water Desalination --
Findings and Recommendations" report.

The additional information is essential in order to provide accurate and useful public comment on the draft.

My specific questions and concerns include the
following:

Where is the Santa Barbara plant classified, if at all? (It is built, but does not fit in any of the three categories: "in Operation", "in Design & Construction" or "Planned or Projected.")

Is the City of Sand City 300-a.f. plant is listed in "Plants in Design & Construction" or "Plants Planned or Projected"? Note that this plant is approved by the CCC, and is incorrectly listed in the CCC March
2004 report as having a maximum capacity of 30 a.f.
The correct capacity is 300 a.f.

How are the California American Moss Landing Plant and the Pajaro/Sunny Mesa CSD Moss Landing Plant accounted for and characterized? The CCC's March 2004 report suggests that the Cal Am plant has a maximum capacity of 10,000 a.f. In fact, Cal Am's materials show that the plant will be built for a maximum capacity of over 20,000 a.f., and may grow even further before the design is finalized. Separately, the Pajaro/Sunny Mesa CSD plant is in the 20,000-30,000 a.f. range, and is not listed in the CCC report. See this Monterey Peninsula Water Management District comparison of the
plants:
http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us/asd/board/boardpacket/2004/20040929/07/item07_exh7a.htm

While it is likely that only one plant will be built of the two (Cal-Am and Pajaro/Sunny Mesa), it appears that they should both be identified and the larger of the two projects should be used for estimating purposes and the best/worst case scenario. Would you

please tell me the reasons behind the Chapter 6 decision to account for those plants and that situation?

Here is an example of critical inconsistencies in the three reports:
(1) the Water Desalination Task Force's October 2003 report suggests that there are 16 permitted seawater dealination facilities that generate 4,600 a.f. per year of desalinated water (page 3, #21) plus 19 planned (page 4, #22).
(2) The CCC report stated that there about a dozen existing desalination facilities (page 15) with total maximum production of 3,300 a.f. per year, plus about 24 planned.
(3) The draft Water Plan Update, Vol. 2, Chapter 6, table states there are 6 seawater plants in operation (page 6-3) with a capacity of 1,440 a.f. per year, plus 6 planned.

While there is some difference in the three reports' terminology (e.g. "existing" vs. "in operation" vs. "permitted"), that alone is insufficient to fix all the inconsistent numbers, both as to quantifying the plants and estimating total capacity. Careful research is important into each plant for the current status.

I would appreciate any help and additional information that you can provide. I am sending this request to both of you so you do not duplicate your efforts in responding. If you are unable to respond, please consider these as Public Comments.

Thank you very much.

Molly Erickson
Monterey